

REMARKS

The applicant thanks Examiner Kristin Sandoval and her supervisor Gilberto Barron for the telephone interview on January 24, 2007, in which claims 1 and 42, and the Shostack, Lyle, and Moran references were discussed.

The applicant notes that the cited references do not disclose and would not have suggested determining, at the home location, an anomaly at one of the client locations based on an analysis of at least the possible security problems at two or more client locations, in which detecting possible security problems, transmitting notice of the possible security problems, and determining the anomaly based on the possible security problems occur continuously in real time, as recited in claim 1.

Shostack discloses a network security detector that can monitor the complete network (col. 7, lines 5-6) and perform a comprehensive security assessment of the network (col. 7, lines 20-21). Lyle discloses sniffers that provide information concerning suspicious data (col. 7, lines 15-17) and an analysis framework that processes the suspicious data (col. 7, lines 55-57). However, neither Shostack nor Lyle discloses or suggests determining an anomaly at "one of the client locations" based on an analysis of at least the possible security problems at "two or more of the client locations." Although the systems of Shostack and Lyle may detect security problems at one client location using a security vulnerability database (e.g., col. 7, lines 53-54 of Shostack), and the database may include information obtained from other client locations, comparing information obtained from one client location with historical data that includes information obtained from another client location does not meet the limitation "in which detecting possible security problems, transmitting notice of the possible security problems, and determining the anomaly based on the possible security problems occur continuously in real time," as recited in claim 1.

Claims 9, 17, 28, 30, 40, 41 are patentable for at least similar reasons as those applied to claim 1.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the Examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the Examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the Examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, reference 10559-463001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2007 _____

/Rex I. Huang/_____
Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906